

tions, point us in the direction of the enshrining of general principles in legislation, as a base to any scheme. The overseas schemes provide ready-made, clear models. But principles, in themselves, are not enough. The principles should be administered by an overseeing body, such as a Privacy Commissioner. Such a Commissioner would have a number of functions. These would need to include:

- monitoring;
- auditing personal data bases for compliance with data principles;
- education;
- dealing with disputes by mediation or determination;
- enforcing rights of access and correction;
- making recommendations for change;
- developing specific codes for particular industries such as credit reference agencies;
- studying the impact of future technology;
- examining proposed legislation;
- encouraging self regulation and co-operation.

Mr McBride's suggestion that a Privacy Commissioner be part of the Human Rights Commission is logical. The Commission's privacy jurisdiction already encompasses many of the important features of a statutory guardian for privacy interests. The scope of any future scheme is very important. It would seem to be essential that both the public and the private sector be subject to controls. A unified approach to data privacy is preferable because the conduct and decisions of commercial and professional agencies affect our lives as profoundly as those of state bodies.

The question of whether both natural and legal persons should be able to avail themselves of data privacy is a difficult one. First inclinations are to dispense the right to privacy as widely as possible. But this has to be examined in depth. Misuse of privacy rights might allow legal persons, such as companies, to gain unfair commercial advantages. And many argue that data protection laws are tied to a concept of privacy rights as personal. This human rights interpretation would preclude legal persons from exercising such rights. I am undecided on this point. However, it may be possible to grant companies the rights,

and maintain control over their use in other ways, such as by clearly defining personal information.

Another attractive proposition which would sit well with such a scheme is that of requiring each data base operator to nominate one particular individual to be responsible for access requests. That person would be the normal contact for the Privacy Commissioner who would also carry out spot audits on a routine basis. I suspect this would be the most effective way of enforcing the legislative provisions. Clearly the Privacy Commissioner must know where the country's personal data bases are kept. In drafting the legislation we will need to think about whether it is essential to have a public register of all personal data bases.

It is a combination of the components I have described which will produce a good data protection scheme for New Zealand. Most of these features have been tried overseas, and it is therefore possible to see how they work in practice. But the question arises as to how such a scheme would sit with the Official Information Act and the Wanganui Computer Centre Act. Naturally, it would be desirable to absorb the various legislative fragments of data protection into a single coherent framework. But it may not be necessary to accord this a high priority. The first priority is to provide remedies where there presently are none. We need adequate protection of privacy rights without stultifying commerce, administration and trade.

Libraries will be affected as holders and disseminators of data. Your data systems contain records not only of names and addresses of borrowers, but also provide profiles of complete reading histories. These histories could be significant in court cases, and I understand at present the policy is not to provide information to third parties such as the police until compelled to. So a coherent system of privacy protection will be welcomed by you. Your thoughts about these issues have been and will continue to be important when legislation is drafted and reaches the Select Committee stage. I hope that what I have said today will be helpful to you in that regard.

It is a pleasure to declare the 1989 New Zealand Library Association Conference open, and to wish you well for the events of the next three days.

THE MAORI PEOPLE AND LIBRARIES

JANE McRAE (1989 Conference paper)

Our session is entitled "The Maori People and Libraries". It may not be a very inspiring title, but it is worded like that because it gives a sense of the distance between the Maori people and the library profession. The Conference, with its major theme of "Making Contact", seemed the right forum in which to talk about how to bring the two together so that we could use a title like: "Ngā Whare Mātauranga o Aotearoa or New Zealand Libraries", a title which would suggest that the development of our nation's libraries is shared by Maori and Pakeha. At present this is not a shared undertaking, and if it is to be, then I think that we have to look to some changes throughout the profession, from education for librarianship to the practice of it.

My paper advocates that our libraries should in the first place reflect the cultures of Maori and Pakeha. I think that

if we can effect that joint administration we may have the right attitudes to accommodate other cultures as well. The case of the Maori people provides a specific example for another argument concerning the accountability of libraries to their communities. That argument claims that the ability of librarians to make contact with and include any of their communities depends on their commitment to consultation and democratic decision making.

I would like first to make explicit the principle which underpins my discussion. It is that the Maori people (the Tangata whenua or indigenous people of Aotearoa) and the Pakeha made a compact in the Treaty of Waitangi which had as its basis or fundamental principle a partnership in government of the country. This principle of a partnership has been espoused by many in the library

profession and by many more in New Zealand society at large. It is becoming central to management policy in our major public and private institutions; it also has cognizance in law (viz. The Treaty of Waitangi in the Court of Appeal). It is, therefore, not idiosyncratic, perverse or radical but widely accepted in New Zealand, and the ideas which inform this principle have parallels in other colonized countries.

If the principle is so widely accepted, why am I bothering to make it explicit? I am doing this because I want to draw attention to the partnership intended by the Treaty in relation to the library profession, and also because what we espouse often bears little relation to what we actually do. To admit such a principle and to realise it in action we have to make two kinds of change: one attitudinal (a change in what we think) and the other behavioural (a change in what we do). I want to show how the principle from the Treaty, which I am taking to be implicit in the best of our professional thinking, holds up in reality, as a theory in action in the library world. And since, as you may expect, I don't think it holds up very well, I also want to make some suggestions about the changes we need to make to improve on that and to work to honour the intention of the Treaty.

If we want to enable Maori and Pakeha to share in the management of libraries, then we have to be prepared to make some changes. I have been thinking how comparatively little time we give to changes that will advance human relations in our libraries. We update structure and function in our administration and we respond very quickly to change which is induced by technological advances. Think, for example, of the fast, far-reaching, and ongoing changes which have attended the introduction of computers into our libraries. With great enthusiasm we have mobilised huge sums of money for training and equipment and we have acquired new and complex skills. We have been quick and ready to change our perspective to meet the computer culture. But when we come to addressing changes relating to improving interaction between people, either staff or clients, we seem very sluggish. The success of our libraries depends first and foremost on the quality of the human behaviour within them, but we invest comparatively little time or money in keeping the mechanics of that behaviour running smoothly. If we were to give our interpersonal behaviour as much attention as we give the computer, the rewards might be considerable. But despite the fact that we constantly strive to achieve perfection in the attractiveness and efficiency of our physical environment, we put little effort into ensuring that we have a pleasant and productive human environment. We resign ourselves to grumblings and acrimonies amongst staff, and leave many of our clients with the impression that librarians are just a larger form of silverfish, darting out occasionally from books, where they have been gnawing their way through the menu of order, and slithering away before they can be caught. If we want to "make contact" with ourselves and our clients, then we need to be as zealous in our attention to human relations as we are to the mechanics of our equipment and administration.

One way to test out the validity of an espoused principle is to assess whether there are discrepancies between what is espoused and what is done. In the context of making contact with Maori people in our libraries, I want to exemplify some of the ways, both in attitude and action, in which we succeed and some of the ways in which we fail to work towards bicultural libraries. By bicultural libraries,

I mean libraries which work to the principle of the Treaty and are attuned to the cultures of Maori and Pakeha, but which are open to the inclusion of other cultures. Many immigrant peoples would, I believe, acknowledge the priority of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha. Albert Wendt affirmed that view at the 1987 NZLA Conference. When asked: "What positive things have you seen in New Zealand and elsewhere assisting multi-culturalism?", he replied "The prior rights of the tangata whenua, the emphasis on biculturalism, and the Maori renaissance."

The library profession has shown some positive, genuine and tangible signs of working towards biculturalism. Let me give a few examples:

1. The Auckland Public Library and the Alexander Turnbull Library each have specialist positions for Maori materials (both at the moment held by Maori people).
2. In 1987 the Auckland University Library opened Te Hukatai, a divisional library in the Maori Studies Section, established exclusively for the acquisition of Maori manuscripts and Maori language texts.
3. The Department of Librarianship has initiated a class in Maori pronunciation and, I believe, is open to discussion about the institution of other courses related to the custodianship of Maori materials.
4. The profession as a whole has been promoted to speak and think about the issue of biculturalism by the publication in *Library Life* (No. 116, July 1988) of a submission to the Joint Advisory Committee on Librarianship by Te Ropu Takawaenga (students in the Dept. of Librarianship 1988). Writers who responded to that submission by letters to *Library Life* (No. 118, September 1988; No. 119, October, 1988) were clearly in favour of the profession being committed to the spirit of the submission. In particular the National Librarian made a statement of intent concerning biculturalism which, as a starting point, is an excellent paradigm for other libraries.
5. There are numerous other examples I could cite, like the extensive statement on biculturalism contained in the National Library's *Equal Employment Opportunities Management Plan Review* (1988, Part III), and their pilot project of books gifted to Kohanga Reo in Tai Tokerau (see report in *Library Life*, No. 114, May 1988); the special attention given to Maori manuscripts in Jane Wild's report to Auckland Public Library of her overseas study tour (*Manuscript Management in Libraries: A Report of a Study Tour* . . . 1987); and the actual work done in libraries by Stephen Murphy at Paraparaumu ("Maoritanga at Paraparaumu Public Library", *New Zealand Libraries*, 1979, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 42-46), Roy Carroll at Manukau City ("Multi-Cultural Library Services: A New Zealand Viewpoint", paper given at NZLA/LAA Conference, Brisbane, August 1984. Typescript p. 6.), and Adrian Birkbeck at the New Lynn Library ("For the People, of the People. Services to Ethnic Minorities at New Lynn Library, the process of change", paper given to NZLA Conference, 1987). There are other examples which I haven't time to acknowledge, I'm sure there are still others which I don't know about.

I do not doubt the value of any of that work or people's commitment to it, but two things concern me. Firstly, who decided that those things would happen? Did Maori people participate in the decisions to make them happen? And secondly, the examples speak of initiatives and objectives, but can they be sustained? Can the positions for Maori specialists have tenure and be increased, and can recruitment for and courses in Librarianship prepare people for those positions? At the moment I question the possibility of us achieving much greater progress towards bicultural libraries because I think that although we carry some ideology about biculturalism, it has very little significance because on the whole it is not translated into action. It is questionable too whether that ideology amounts to much.

In a letter to *Library Life* on Te Ropu Takawaenga's submission (No. 117, August, 1988) Professor Cave pointed out very astutely that biculturalism has not been seen to be important in library service given the fact that there was no mention of it in the submissions to Professor Saunders. I think that is a very important point for it shows that it is simply not part of our professional thinking. Although we may say that we hold to the ideals of biculturalism, there are many, too many, instances when we fail to make this manifest.

Let me now give some examples of those failures, that is, failures in action and in attitude. I could list here some of the things which we haven't done at all, but I think the examples I have chosen show more clearly what sort of state our thinking is in. You may consider some of the instances trifling, but I think they have quite profound implications for the future of biculturalism. You might also, if you are Pakeha, try to imagine how you would feel about them if you were Maori.

1. In one provincial library I have been in there are two Maori language signs - one saying "Mauria mai nga pukapuka ki konei" (Bring your books here) and another, "Whakahokia mai ngaa pukapuka ki konei" (return your books here). They are signs of equivalent size and quality to their English translations (that is, they are not added as a hurried afterthought) but they are the only signs in Maori in the library. So the only visible acknowledgement of Maori language (and by extension the Maori people) in that library are two signs telling them what to do. In discussing with the librarian the possibility of a prominent section for books on Maori topics, we located a suitable site, which, she added, could only be used when another space was found for the biography section. Now, while limits on space might have seemed to offer no other option, there is the underlying inference that "Yes, we would like to share our libraries with Maori people but only if and when we have enough space in our own order of things."
2. The Alexander Turnbull Library moves to its new home in the National Library and it celebrates this and the birthday of Alexander by an occasion at which are presented à la mode of the fashion parade, some of the treasures "of the heritage represented in the Turnbull's collection" (*The Friends of the Turnbull Newsletter*, No. 12, October, 1987) How were the Maori people represented? By a translation into Maori by a Pakeha of a book of the Bible and by Pakeha paintings of Maori people. What happened to

the heritage generated by Maori people, and of their culture? Can we only perceive of Maori people through the translations we make of their culture?

3. In that same building, probably about the same time, work was going on on a new *Union List of New Zealand Newspapers*. I noticed references to this work like "the first complete statement of newspaper holdings . . ." (*ATL Record*, Vol. xxi, No. 1, May 1988, p. 52) and " . . . the complete newspaper resource for New Zealand" (*New Zealand Libraries*, Vol. 45, No. 9, March 1988, p. 202) But it is not complete, because a unique bit of that resource, the Maori newspapers, was by no means completely accounted for. The Preface to the 1987 edition of the *List* notes of titles included, "All newspapers published in New Zealand from 1840 to the end of 1986 . . ."; a list of those excluded does not include the Maori newspapers. I don't believe that Maori newspapers should be a problem to list in their country of origin.

It looks now as if there may be a special project for 1990 of a bibliography of Maori newspapers and a microfilming exercise. This is admirable, if late. But I understand that consideration is being given to applying to the Maori Purposes Fund Board to assist with the project. This I don't understand - are the Maori newspapers not a national resource which the National Library is responsible for? Were publishers of English newspapers approached for money to assist with the latest *Union List*?

4. In the public face of the New Zealand Library Association I see very few signs of a partnership with Maori people. There is no Maori committee, * so no established forum for consulting with Maori people. I have seen a splendid bi-lingual book bag, but what of the image in a "Use your Library" poster (*Library Life*, no. 104, June 1987)? In this illustration of a crowd of people, there is a Maori person wearing a tracksuit and tāniko headband, carrying a book labelled "Sports". It would have been good to have also seen a Pakeha carrying a Maori language book or a cassette of waiata.
5. Finally, I have an example which may be a great success or a terrible failure. A number of Auckland librarians met last year to work out recommendations for changes at a national level to the cataloguing of Maori words and titles. One participant mentioned that she had just learnt that "taniwha" (a mythological creature, monster, dragon) had been officially accepted by the NZBN standards committee. I found this somewhat startling, and irritating. Taniwha are significant and memorable creatures in Maori oral tradition; they have supernatural powers which can bring good and evil. In tribal traditions they are usually described as inhabiting a particular area which they move throughout, emerging at various marked spots. "Na, kua puta tetahi taniwha i waingānui i a tātou" (Well, a taniwha has come amongst us.) I wonder whose taniwha has emerged in NZBN and whether it is malevolent or benevolent? Will it use its powers to reward the system or will it be a computer hacker? Let's hope there's no programmer St George in NZBN. But the irritating aspect of this news to me was how the word ever got there? Who decided that

* The NZLA now has a Bi-culturalism committee. — Ed.

this was the word which should go in? And why one? How did one Maori word suddenly surface in a national system? Understandable perhaps if it was a Finnish word, but a lone Maori word? What happened to the thesaurus of Maori words that ought to have been approved?

What I think that these examples show is that we have a long way to go to put our theories about biculturalism into action. I think what we are doing is piecemeal and not thought through, but more significantly I suspect that what has been done has been decided on without consultation with Maori people. You might say that it has been well-intentioned - but for me that would confirm a lack of consultation because most well-intentioned deeds are done for other people, without their consent. I'm afraid that that essentially patriarchal and autocratic behaviour has been all too typical of the Pakeha in New Zealand, and the consequences for Maori people have been disastrous.

I'd like to offer some thoughts on how as a profession we might go about making contact between the Maori people and libraries closer and mutually satisfying. Firstly I would like to refer to some specifics of learning about Maori culture and then touch on the process that must underpin any learning for it to be effectively put to action; that process applies equally to libraries being accountable to their communities.

Libraries provide a service in New Zealand, our country of two "official" cultures. If librarians are to do their job properly they must provide a service to both cultures. The service may be limited by librarians' lack of knowledge of one or the other culture; in this case I am talking about limits to services because of librarians' lack of knowledge about Maori culture. It seems to me that for Pakeha many failures to interact productively with Maori people occur simply because we know so little about them and their culture. If we are to give them due recognition, then we have to learn about that culture. An important start in that learning, essential for librarians, is to listen to the language, that is to say, to accept it as a living official language in our country. I am not suggesting that all librarians should be fluent in Maori; it might be nice, but I'm sure it's unrealistic. I am suggesting that they should be able to recognise Maori words when spoken and pronounce them correctly. When we learn to pronounce Maori words, we are also likely to learn what commonly used words mean. In addition we will have some understanding of the bank of key words which (ought to) make up the subject heading in our catalogue; we will be likely to spell Maori words and names correctly, if we have bi-lingual signs we will be able to pronounce them, and so on.

All librarians should have that degree of familiarity with Maori language; many should be fluent in it. Given that familiarity and fluency librarians will be alerted to the "texts" of Maori language and appreciate their uniqueness to our country; our collections will alter accordingly. It could be said that Maori oral tradition provides an important exemplar for today's library, for that tradition has been recorded in many different forms - in taped recordings, visual images, manuscripts, and books. The assumption that libraries are only for written works is now outdated. Although literature still has immense value, we are increasingly giving attention to other forms of text. Indeed, as scholars of the development of writing confirm, we have vastly overrated the significance of writing and failed

to appreciate the pervasiveness of orality. Tom McArthur in *Worlds of Reference* (1986, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), a fascinating account of the recording and storage of knowledge, has rocked the librarian's pedestal by saying that in terms of the human race, libraries and computer storage of information are "late, brief and fragile" (p. 3) Walter Ong has written: "Those who think of the text as the paradigm of all discourse need to face the fact that only the tiniest fraction of languages has ever been written or ever will be Hard core textualism is snobbery, often hardly disguised" (in Baumann, Gerd (ed.), *The Written Word. Literacy in Transition*, 1986, Oxford, Clarendon Press p.26). Some have even suggested the eventual demise of the book. George Steiner in a recent article in the *Times Literary Supplement* (July 8-14, 1988, p. 754) commented on the diverse forms of oral literature which are beginning to play a major role in the totality of modern communication, and even suggested that the age of the book in its classical sense is now coming to a gradual end.

Librarians need to be attentive to changes in the nature of and demands on their collections. Here in New Zealand we have long had the chance to be aware of changes in the demands for different forms of texts. If we had been up with the play in our knowledge of Maori oral literature, that is to say, if we had given it the same serious attention that has been given, for example, to the great oral literature of Greece (and for those of you who may be sceptical of such a comparison, I would refer you to Otago's Emeritus Professor of Greek, Agathe Thornton's recent publication *Maori Oral Literature*), we might have learnt a lot about valuing and so acquiring forms other than books, earlier, rather than later in the day.

The breadth and richness of the learning we could have acquired, had we had an open and enquiring attitude to Maori culture, is evident in this example which I have taken from one very close to our profession and home, Professor Don McKenzie. Many of you will know his book *Oral Culture, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand* (1985, Wellington, VUP/ATL Trust), a telling commentary on the misunderstandings that can arise between those of oral and literate cultures. But he has yet more to say to our profession in his book *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (1986, London, British Library). Here he again asserts that bibliography deserves to be defined as the study of the sociology of all forms of texts. Using an example from Australian Aboriginal tradition (which could easily find a parallel in Maori oral tradition), McKenzie proposes that there is a sense in which land itself might be a text (p. 31). He says that where the case for Aboriginal land rights is being most successfully made, for example, against those with mining rights, it is by virtue of the stories which the land holds, the codification in landscape of a whole tribal culture (p. 32). I would like to quote what he says next: "It is the narrative power of the land, its textual status, which now supports a political structure dedicated to the belated preservation of the texts which make up a culture. If we can but think the question through that way round, think not of books as the only form of textual artefact, but of texts of many different material forms, only some of which are books or documents, then we begin to see a principle at work which has quite staggering social, economic and political implications. The argument that a rock in Arunta country (think of a mountain in Maori tribal tradition) is a text subject to bibliographical exposition is

absurd only if one thinks of arranging such rocks on a shelf and giving them classmarks. It is the importation into Arunta land of a single-minded obsession with book-forms, in the highly relative context of the last few hundred years of European history, which is the real absurdity" (p. 32-33). McKenzie's thinking about texts is profound and I am sure that what he (and others) are saying will come to have implications for us as librarians. But what also occurs to me is that we could have learnt that too - if only we had approached the matter of the Maori people and libraries in a truly consultative fashion. Because we haven't, from a professional point of view we have missed an opportunity to accession and make available in some remarkable and innovative ways, a great range of Maori texts. But it is not just a failure in our professional competence that is disappointing here, but the failure to respect and appreciate the Maori people and to promote the country's unique library of literature.

By not broadening our minds to a real appreciation of Maori language and literature, we have narrowed our own horizons and played out a role solely modelled on the other, although also relevant, Pakeha tradition. But what about the tradition that was already there, and is still here? We have, to borrow a phrase from Cliff Lashley's article on the development of West Indian libraries, to build a great tradition of our own; one which respects both Maori and Pakeha ("West Indian National Libraries and the Challenge of Change" in Ingram K. E. & A. A. Jefferson (eds), 1975, *Libraries and the Challenge of Change*, Papers of the International Library Conference held in Kingston, Jamaica, 24-29 April, 1972.)

In choosing only to talk about language and literature, I am of course just touching the surface of the vast and fascinating learning that can be done about Maori culture, about the physical environment the Maori people inhabit, and about the tikanga or customs that relate to their environment and beliefs. But to give real attention to any of those areas, there has to be, as there has to be for any real learning, a concurrent attitude that is open and enquiring. There also has to be willingness to consult, to go to those who can do the teaching, in this case to Maori people. That same attitude, of openness and enquiry and willingness to consult, must inform our interaction with people, if our intentions about biculturalism are to be substantiated by action and our libraries are to be accountable to our communities.

What I have suggested in this paper is that as librarians we have been holding views on biculturalism and attempting to put them into practice on our own, constructing

theories about what is appropriate and failing to consult with those whom the theory is about as to whether it is acceptable. Such a methodology wouldn't hold up in the scientific world, and it doesn't hold up in the human world either. If we make assumptions about what people want, we are very likely to be wrong; the less we know them, the more likely we are to be wrong. The process of consultation, of checking one's assumptions, underpins the best thinking and scholarly study; it also underpins the best interaction between people, and is essential to democratic decision-making. (That process can be explored more fully in the works of, for example, Chris Argyris, *Reason, Learning and Action*, 1982, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass; Chris Argyris & Donald Schon, *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*, 1976, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass; and Michael Absolum, "Behaving for the Future: Developing Processes for Democratic Relating", Unpublished Thesis, Dip.Ed.Psych, AU, 1985.)

If librarians take up the challenge to become bicultural using a model of consultation and democratic decision making, then they have a greater chance of being relevant to the many communities that they serve. It is a strange, perhaps telling thing, that the issue of user pays has highlighted this. Suddenly we are concerned about accountability, that what we do is approved by our clients. Michael Kirby made the points at last year's Conference that the promotion of fee-based services might have the beneficial consequence of increasing the effective accountability of librarians to their users, and that in every profession there have been significant moves to increase the accountability of important decision-making to the community being served ("User pays, libraries and accountability", *New Zealand Libraries*, Vol. 45, No. 10, June 1988, p.209-210). It's interesting that the user pays philosophy has prompted us to consider an accountability that should, after all, always have been there.

I have suggested in this paper that, despite some efforts to the contrary, our libraries remain largely monocultural. I think that an impediment to our success with biculturalism has been our Pakeha closedness to Maori people and their culture. If as a profession we espouse the partnership principle of the Treaty, then we must set about doing our part properly. When the profession and Maori people come to consult with each other over the development of libraries, then we will have libraries which serve the needs of both our cultures. Kia ora.

Jane McRae is the Maori Studies Librarian at Te Hukatai, University of Auckland Library.

Meet My Koro . . .

CUSHLA PAREKOWHAI (1989 Conference paper)

You know times like this usually make me a bit nervous eh. I sort of hop up, have a look around and think "O Crikey what am I supposed to say next?" For me this feels pretty strange really since I'm a talker eh. Always have been. One of those bloody cheery wide-mouth frogs, who never shuts up. So here we are then. Eeek! You out there, smiling away just beautiful and me up here wondering — "O.K. so what do we do now?"

Probably the best way to begin this is to describe for you the circumstances which resulted in this opportunity to speak. It's quite interesting when you really get down to it. Last year I was involved with a group of students all doing the Dip.Libship. at the Library School at Victoria University in Wellington. Around about that time the Joint Advisory Committee on Library Education asked for submissions on the Saunders Report which had been